

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 26, 2004 has been carefully reviewed. Claims 1-13, 15 and 19-23 have been canceled. Claims 24 and 25 are amended herein. Claims 26-39 are added herein. No new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 24-39 are pending. Reconsideration of the grounds of rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

Summary of the Office Action

References to paragraphs in the subject office action are referred to herein in parentheses identifying the appropriate paragraph, e.g. (para x).

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12, 13, 15, and 21-25 have also been rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by “The Anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual web search engine” by Sergey et al. (“Sergey”) (para 3).

Claims 3-6, 10, 11, 19 and 20 have been rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Sergey in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,832 B1, issued to Saylor et al. (“Saylor”) (para 5).

Applicants have added new claims 26-39. It is respectfully submitted that pending claims 24-39 represent patentable subject matter, because the prior art fails to disclose each and every element of these claims.

Response to Office Action

A. Rejection of Claims 24 and 25

In response to the Examiner’s rejection of claims 24-25, the Applicants respectfully submit that Sergey fails to disclose each and every element of claims 24-25. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

1. Rejection of Claim 24

Claim 24 is directed to a method of providing news relating to a specified subject to a subscriber. The method is comprised of the following steps: selecting a plurality of Web sites operated by content providers and relating to a category to which the specified subject relates; automatically determining the relevancy of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words relating to the specified subject; automatically determining the content type of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words indicating content type; compiling a list of relevant Web pages based on the results of steps (b) and (c), wherein the list of relevant Web pages includes only those Web pages that are determined both to be relevant in step (b) and to be of news content type in step (c) wherein the compiled list includes hyperlinks to the relevant Web pages; and providing the compiled list to the subscriber, wherein the subscriber is a party other than one of said content providers, wherein the providing comprises transmitting the compiled list from a Web server to the subscriber over the Internet.

Sergey does not disclose the underlined claim elements as shown for claim 24. Regarding this claim limitation, the Examiner has cited Sergey page 12 and Figure 4. The cited section of Sergey discloses the results of a two word key word search. The web pages in the compiled list contain a wide variety of content, e.g., the White House site, email, and political web sites. The content of the search result in Figure 4 is not limited to only relevant news content. The Applicants respectfully submit that the web sites shown in Figure 4 does not list web pages that are both relevant and contain news content. Sergey, furthermore, does not disclose a mechanism to return relevant pages containing only news content.

Likewise Sergey fails to disclose each and every element of claims 30, 34 and 38 which contain the same elements as claim 24.

2. Rejection of Claim 25

Claim 25 is directed to a method of providing news relating to a specified subject to a subscriber. The method is comprised of the following steps: selecting a plurality of Web sites operated by content

providers and relating to a category to which the specified subject relates; automatically determining the relevancy of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words relating to the specified subject; automatically determining the content type of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words indicating content type; compiling a list of relevant Web pages based on the results of steps (b) and (c), wherein the list of relevant Web pages includes only those Web pages that are determined both to be relevant in step (b) and not to be advertisements in step (c) wherein the compiled list includes hyperlinks to the relevant Web pages; and providing the compiled list to the subscriber, wherein the subscriber is a party other than one of said content providers, wherein the providing comprises transmitting the compiled list from a Web server to the subscriber over the Internet.

Sergey does not disclose the underlined claim elements as shown for claim 25. Regarding the claim 25 claim limitation of “wherein the list of relevant Web pages includes only those Web pages that are determined both to be relevant in step (b) and not to be advertisements in step (c), wherein the compiled list includes hyperlinks to the relevant Web pages,” the Examiner has cited Sergey page 11, last paragraph. This section of Sergey discloses Google’s mechanism for multiword key word searches. In particular, how to process hit lists from multiword searches and how to analyze the proximity of multiple hits. The results for multiword searches show results only for web pages containing the multiple key words. The Applicants respectfully submit this cited section is not the same as compiling web pages that include only relevant pages and pages that are not advertisements. Sergey does not even discuss how to search for relevant pages without advertisements or how to eliminate web pages with advertisements from a compiled list of relevant pages.

Likewise Sergey fails to disclose each and every element of claims 31, 35 and 39 which contain the same elements as claim 25.

B. New claims 26-39.

Claim 26 is directed to a method of providing news relating to a specified subject to a subscriber, comprising the steps of: selecting a plurality of Web sites operated by content providers and relating to a category to which the specified subject relates, wherein the plurality of Web sites is selected based on the frequency with which relevant links have been located in prior iterations of the method with respect to the specified subject; automatically determining the relevancy of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words relating to the specified subject; automatically determining the content type of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words indicating content type; compiling a list of relevant Web pages based on the results of steps (b) and (c), wherein the compiled list includes hyperlinks to the relevant Web pages; and providing the compiled list to the subscriber, wherein the subscriber is a party other than one of said content providers, wherein the providing comprises transmitting the compiled list from a Web server to the subscriber over the Internet.

The Applicants submit that Sergey does not disclose the underlined claim elements as shown for claim 26. Sergey, section 4.5.2, discloses a user feedback mechanism in which the user evaluates the returned search results. The user feedback is then used to modify the ranking function at some future date. The Applicants respectfully submit that the user feedback of Sergey could be based on numerous criteria and is not necessarily based on the frequency of locating a link, relevant to the specified subject, in prior searches. Sergey does not even disclose the types of criteria the user feedback may use to evaluate returned search results. Applicants assert that the invention described in claim 26 does not require input from the user unlike Sergey.

Likewise Sergey fails to disclose each and every element of claims 28, 32 and 36 which contain the same elements as claim 26.

4. New claims 27, 29, 33 and 37

Claim 27 is directed to a method of providing news relating to a specified subject to a subscriber, comprising the steps of: selecting a plurality of Web sites operated by content providers and relating to a

category to which the specified subject relates, wherein the plurality of Web sites is selected based on the frequency with which relevant links have been located in prior iterations of the method with respect to the same category; automatically determining the relevancy of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words relating to the specified subject; automatically determining the content type of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words indicating content type; compiling a list of relevant Web pages based on the results of steps (b) and (c), wherein the compiled list includes hyperlinks to the relevant Web pages; and providing the compiled list to the subscriber, wherein the subscriber is a party other than one of said content providers, wherein the providing comprises transmitting the compiled list from a Web server to the subscriber over the Internet.

The Applicants submit that Sergey does not disclose the underlined claim elements as shown for claim 27. Sergey, section 4.5.2, was discussed above. The Applicants respectfully submit that user feedback mechanism is not necessarily based on the frequency that prior iterations have located a link relevant to the same category of information. The user feedback could be based on numerous criteria. Sergey does not even disclose the types of criteria the user feedback may use to evaluate returned search results. Applicants assert that the invention described in claim 27 does not require input from the user unlike Sergey.

Likewise Sergey fails to disclose each and every element of claims 29, 33 and 37 which contain the same elements as claim 27.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that pending independent claims 24-39 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and timely allowance of claims 24-39 are requested.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) presented in the Office Action mailed April 26, 2004. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 215-963-5055 to discuss any matter concerning this Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of the response to Deposit Account No. **50-0310**.

Respectfully submitted,

7/26/04

Date

By: 

Daniel H. Golub
Reg. No. 33,701
Sharon B. McCullen
Reg. No. 54,303
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921
Telephone: (215) 963-5055
Facsimile: (215) 963-5299